

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
Charles K. Verhoeven (CA Bar No. 170151)
Antonio R. Sistos (CA Bar No. 238847)
Emily C. O'Brien (CA Bar No. 240072)
Andrew M. Holmes (CA Bar No. 260475)
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (415) 875-6600
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700
Email: charlesverhoeven@quinnmanuel.com
antoniosistos@quinnmanuel.com
emilyobrien@quinnmanuel.com
drewholmes@quinnmanuel.com

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Patrick Curran (*Pro Hac Vice*)

51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor

New York, NY 10010

Telephone: (212) 849-7000

Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

Email: patrickcurran@quinnmanuel.com

[Additional Counsel Listed on Complaint]

Attorneys for Plaintiff EMC Corporation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

EMC CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

VS.

BRIGHT RESPONSE, LLC.

Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:12-cv-02841-EMC

**JOINT STIPULATION TO CONTINUE
THE BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR
DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS TO DISMISS
AND/OR TRANSFER**

[L.R. 6-1, 6-2, 7-12]

Pursuant to this Court's Order (Dkt. No. 39) and Civil Local Rules 6-1, 6-2, and 7-12, EMC Corporation ("EMC") and Bright Response, LLC ("Bright Response," and together with EMC the "Parties") respectfully declare and stipulate to continue the briefing schedule for Bright Response's motions to dismiss and/or transfer (Dkt. Nos. 23 and 25) as follows:

1. The due date for EMC's Oppositions to the Bright Response motions to
2. dismiss and/or transfer (Dkt. Nos. 23 and 25) is continued from August 14,
3. 2012 to no later than August 21, 2012.
4. The due date for Bright Response's Replies in support of its motions to
5. dismiss and/or transfer (Dkt. Nos. 23 and 25) is continued from August 21,
6. 2012 to no later than August 28, 2012.

The purpose for the extensions of time is to allow EMC to investigate the issues and allegations raised in Bright Response's motions. In accordance with Civil Local Rule 6-2(a)(2), the only time modifications to the case thus far have been two stipulated extensions of time for Bright Response to respond to the complaint. (Dkt. Nos. 12 and 17.) In accordance with Civil Local Rule 6-2(a)(3), the Parties do not believe that the requested time modifications will have any impact on the case schedule as one has not yet been set.

SO STIPULATED:

DATED: August 10, 2012

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP

By /s/ Andrew M. Holmes
Andrew M. Holmes

Attorneys for Plaintiff EMC Corporation

DATED: August 10, 2012

BLACK CHANG & HAMILL LLP

By /s/ Bradford J. Black
Bradford J. Black

Attorneys for Defendant Bright Response, LLC

ATTESTATION

I, Andrew M. Holmes, hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from Bradford J. Black, counsel for Bright Response, LLC. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 10th day of August, 2012 in San Francisco, California.

By /s/ Andrew M. Holmes
Andrew M. Holmes

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 8/13/12

United States Dist

